

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/979,810	ONO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark Fadok	3625

All Participants:

Status of Application: Board decision

(1) Mark Fadok.

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. John Mattingly.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 July 2005

Time: 7:00

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Board of Appeals Decision mailed 9/22/2004.

Claims discussed:

all independent claims

Prior art documents discussed:

Talati

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted Mr. Mattingly to determine if there was an applicant initiated reason that the Board Decision had not been processed to date. Mr. Mattingly responded that he was aware of no reason why the Board decision had not been addressed by the PTO. The examiner informed the applicant the an allowance was being considered, but that the allowable subject matter cited by the board although sufficient to overcome the cited art was not sufficient to overcome art identified in a current search by the examiner. The examiner suggested that the applicant place the comparing of the trading identifier and the e-mail address feature, as is defined in claim 1, into the added independent claims to differentiate the instant claims from the prior art. Mr. Mattingly noted that the combination of status indicators along with the identifier that is related to all the indicators is sufficient to overcome the prior art, Mr. Mattingly pointed to Figures 8-14 of the instant application. The examiner agreed to search complete the search with this nuance being considered..